DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 379 813 EC 303 686

TITLE	A Policy Forum on Inclusion and the Role of Special Education in Restructuring: Focus on Language Minority Students (Alexandria, Virginia, September 18-19, 1994). Final Report.
INSTITUTION	National Association of State Directors of Special Education, Alexandria, VA.
SPONS AGENCY	Special Education Programs (ED/OSERS), Washington, DC.
PUB DATE	14 Dec 94
CONTRACT	HS92015001
NOTE	58p.; Prepared by Project FORUM.
PUB TYPE	Collected Works - Conference Proceedings (021)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Disabilities; Educational Change; *Educational Methods; Educational Policy; Elementary Secondary Education; *Inclusive Schools; Instructional Design; Instructional Effectiveness; *Limited English Speaking; Regular and Special Education Relationship; *Special Education; *Special Needs Students; Teaching Methods

ABSTRACT

This document reports on the design, purpose, implementation, and outcomes of a policy forum entitled "Inclusion and the Role of Special Education in Restructuring: Focus on Language Minority Students" held in September 1994. Participants included representatives from the research and public school communities as well as from relevant offices of the U.S. Department of Education. The first section presents information on the purpose and organization of the policy forum, noting the critical need for more research and teacher training for effective inclusion of language minority students with disabilities and the forum's major thrust on instructional issues. The second section summarizes outcomes of the forum. These include a listing of key issues and effective practices identified by participants. General practices are listed as well as practices specific to primary, intermediate, and secondary levels. Extensive appendices include a list of participants, sample communications with participants, the agenda, and materials shared by participants. These materials include the following two articles: (1) "Literacy Support across Multiple Sites: Experiences of Chinese American LEP Children in Inner Cities" (Ji-Mei Chang and Grace Fung); and (2) "Modulating Instruction for Language Minority Students: Implications of Contemporary Research" (Russell Gersten and Robert Jimenez). (Both appended papers contain extensive references.) (DB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 379 813

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

A POLICY FORUM ON INCLUSION AND THE ROLE OF SPECIAL EDUCATION IN RESTRUCTURING: FOCUS ON LANGUAGE MINORITY STUDENTS

Final Report
Year 2 Deliverable #9-2-4
Under Contract No. HS92015001
September 18-19, 1994

Prepared for:
Office of Special Education Programs
U.S. Department of Education

Prepared by:
Project FORUM

National Association of State Directors of Special Education
1800 Diagonal Road, Suite 320
Alexandria, VA 22314

EC 303686

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

This report was supported in whole or in part by the U.S. Department of Education (Contract No. HS92015001). However, the opinions expressed herein do not necessarily reflect the position or policy of the U.S. Department of Education, and no official endorsement by the Department should be inferred.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

Project FORUM extends its sincere appreciation to the individuals listed below who reviewed and commented on an earlier draft of this document. Their efforts served to enrich the document's quality and accuracy. A special thanks to Russell Gersten for his leadership and effort in the design and implementation of the forum. Our acknowledgement of these individuals does not necessarily indicate their endorsement of the final product.

Carolyn Adger
English Language Multicultural
Education Division
Center for Applied Linguistics

Leonard Baca
Bueno Center for Multicultural Education
University of Colorado

Candace Bos
Department of Special Education
and Rehabilitation
University of Arizona

Russell Gersten
Eugene Research Institute
University of Oregon

Anne Graves
Special Education
San Diego State University

Sharon Vaughn
School of Education
University of Miami

ABSTRACT

This report is the result of a policy forum convened by Project FORUM, a contract funded by the Office of Special Education Programs of the U.S. Department of Education and located at the National Association of State Directors of Special Education (NASDSE). Project FORUM carries out a variety of activities that provide information needed for program improvement, and promote the utilization of research data and other information for improving outcomes for students with disabilities. The project also provides technical assistance and information on emerging issues, and convenes small work groups to gather expert input, obtain feedback, and develop conceptual frameworks related to critical topics in special education.

This document reports on the design, purpose, implementation and outcomes of a policy forum entitled Inclusion and the Role of Special Education in Restructuring: Focus on Language Minority Students held at Holiday Inn-Old Town on September 18-19, 1994. Participants included representatives from the research and public school communities. In addition, representatives from the following offices of the U.S. Department of Education participated in the meeting: Office of Bilingual Education and Minority Language Affairs, (OBEMLA), Office of Special Education and Rehabilitation Services, (OSERS), Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP).

The conclusion and recommendations of the forum included the identification of a number of key issues, and effective practices in the current knowledge base. A follow up meeting with a diverse group of stakeholders to share perspectives on the accessibility of research findings for practitioners was also recommended.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. PURPOSE AND ORGANIZATION OF THE POLICY FORUM 1

A. Background and Purpose 1

B. Preparation for the Policy Forum 2

1. Selection of participants 2
2. Logistical details 2

C. Process of the Policy Forum 2

II. OUTCOMES OF THE POLICY FORUM 4

A. Summary of Input by Participants 4

1. Key Issues 4
2. Current Knowledge Base 5

B. Future Project FORUM Activities Resulting from the Forum 9

APPENDIX A - Participants List 10

APPENDIX B - Communications with Participants 14

APPENDIX C - Agenda 18

APPENDIX D - Materials shared by Participants 22

POLICY FORUM ON INCLUSION AND THE ROLE OF SPECIAL EDUCATION IN RESTRUCTURING: FOCUS ON LANGUAGE MINORITY STUDENTS

I. PURPOSE AND ORGANIZATION OF THE POLICY FORUM

A. Background and Purpose

The past decade has seen major demographic shifts and the largest wave of immigrants of the century. All segments of the educational system have been overwhelmed by the large numbers of culturally and linguistically diverse (CLD) students entering the educational system. Special education, in particular, has been besieged by large numbers of referrals and demands for services. The inclusion movement, as well as plans to restructure schools so that special education, Chapter 1, and bilingual education are all parts of a comprehensive program, holds great potential for this group of students. However, to date, little work has been done to delineate the critical issues in providing quality instruction in the general education classroom to students with disabilities who also have limited knowledge of English.

The purpose of this forum was to begin to explore the implications of the emerging knowledge base for issues of inclusion and restructuring. The goal was to develop a series of guidelines for policy makers and practitioners as they consider plans for inclusion of language minority students. A subsequent forum could then present these guidelines to groups of state education agency (SEA) and local education agency (LEA) administrators, teachers, and parents.

Two broad issues regarding inclusion of language minority students were raised in a preliminary meeting held in May, 1994:

- Research must address the needs and outcomes of language minority students separately, rather than simply aggregating scores or excluding them from assessments.

- Teacher training for inclusion (both inservice and preservice) must address language minority students with disabilities.

The major thrust of this forum was instructional issues. Issues of assessment, identification, placement, and referral are addressed elsewhere. Much effort has gone into the special education decision-making process and too little into understanding the critical features of effective learning environments for these students. In particular, techniques and procedures for establishing a classroom climate that encourages students to use language

in the classroom to express ideas and thought about content are emphasized. Although it is always preferable to have a teacher who understands students' native languages, this is not always feasible. Thus, the forum focused on techniques that can be used by special educators and teachers who do not speak the students' native languages.

B. Preparation for the Policy Forum

1. Selection of participants

Project FORUM staff worked with staff from the U.S. Department of Education, Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) and Russell Gersten, from the University of Oregon/Eugene Research Institute and Coordinator of the OSEP Language Minority Research Task Force, to identify participants for the forum. Those invited to the forum are active researchers in the area of instruction for language minority students; some have specific interest and expertise in language minority students with disabilities. A number of participants had attended previous meetings in the fall of 1993 and spring of 1994 for the purpose of defining a research agenda focusing on inclusion and making research accessible to practitioners. A local teacher and school board member also participated in the forum.

In addition, representatives from the following offices at the U.S. Department of Education (US-ED) participated in the meeting: Office of Special Education and Rehabilitation Services (OSERS), Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP), and Office of Bilingual Education and Minority Languages Affairs (OBEMLA). Other staff from OBEMLA and the Office of Civil Rights attended as observers. A list of participants is included as Appendix A.

2. Logistical details

The meeting was held on September 18-19, 1994 at the Holiday Inn-Old Town in Alexandria, Virginia. This location provided easy access via National Airport for out-of-town participants, as well as facilitating the participation of staff members from NASDSE and USED.

C. Process of the Policy Forum

The policy forum was facilitated by Joy Hicks of Project FORUM at NASDSE and Russell Gersten, Coordinator of the OSEP Language Minority Research Task Force. The format allowed for participation of the entire group, with specific topics presented by some participants and feedback provided by all participants.

Activities on the first afternoon began with an overview of the agenda for the following day. Joy Hicks then described Project FORUM and its goals, including an

ongoing interest in disproportionate placement of language and cultural minority students in special education. Jane Williams, from OSEP, shared her office's interest in the increasing numbers of language minority students in special education and the responsibility of the states for appropriate delivery of services. She offered to provide copies of a recent paper by Beth Harry of the University of Maryland on *The Disproportionate Representation of Minority Students in Special Education: Theories and Recommendations*. The report was commissioned by Project FORUM. Russell Gersten guided a discussion about the format of a proposed book that will present effective instructional practices for language minority students with disabilities for teachers, who are not second language specialists.

There was a brief discussion about the phrase "language minority" students and other terminology. "Language minority" includes students who do not qualify as limited English proficient (LEP). The term "LEP" was seen as too clinical and having a deficit or negative connotation. The term "second language learners" was seen as more positive, but it does not indicate the special needs that "language minority" infers.

On the second day, Joy Hicks welcomed the group back and introduced Beatriz Mitchell, who brought greetings from the Assistant Secretary of OSERS, Judith Heumann, and Thomas Hehir, Director of OSEP. She noted that quality education for LEP students is of great concern to Judith Heumann. Ms. Mitchell also described activities of Fiesta Educativa and other parent groups. She made three requests of the group, that they (1) provide input for the upcoming reauthorization of IDEA, (2) encourage minority researchers to apply for major research funds, and (3) consider responding to OSERS' requests for proposals because OSERS is particularly interested in collaborative efforts.

The discussion throughout the day focused on key issues related to inclusion and language minority students, and the status of the knowledge base. Specific topics included effective instruction for language minority students during transition into English instruction, primary and early literacy, upper elementary transition into English, middle school focus on writing, and high school instruction.

In the afternoon, the discussion turned to identifying issues and activities for the group's future work, including:

- A follow up meeting with a diverse group of stakeholders to share perspectives on accessibility of research findings for practitioners,
- A follow up meeting with researchers to further define research questions and activities,
- The development of materials for practitioners which reflect research findings and provide techniques and strategies for effective instruction for language minority

students with disabilities, and

- The need to identify barriers and strategies to defuse them into different settings.

II. OUTCOMES OF THE POLICY FORUM

A. Summary of Input by Participants

The participants identified a number of key issues, as well as effective practices, in the current knowledge base. Brief summaries follow.

1. Key Issues

- Both policy and instructional perspectives are critical to the issue of inclusion of language minority students.
- There is a need to look at the history of inclusion/exclusion in order to learn from past problems and strive to avoid them.
- Resources for inclusion should be viewed in the context of a philosophy of multiple environments--home and community--rather than an isolated six-hour block at school.
- There is a need to look at inclusion more broadly; this can help create a common *mindset* and remove the barriers resulting from "for or against" attitudes.
- Inclusion should not be seen as a place, a service delivery model, or a set of procedures and regulations, but as a philosophy and a way of thinking about children.
- While some people are concerned that inclusion is implemented to reduce costs, research indicates it is more expensive.
- Students and families must be informed about and made aware of educational and service delivery changes resulting from inclusion. When changes are made in the way services to students are provided, student progress must be monitored to see if it is effective for both academic and social progress.
- The effects on the majority (non-disabled) must be considered as well as the marginalized populations we are concerned with. Also, how does inclusion affect gifted and talented and higher achieving students?
- To be effective, restructuring in special and bilingual education must be part of a

whole movement, not separate and unique; both make contributions to the whole.

- With recent changes in the student population, and more language minority students in schools and in special education, staff roles have not been clearly defined.

- Philosophical and pedagogical paradigms are changing. The merging of theory and practice must reflect these changes.

- Many teachers are asked to implement inclusive instruction and collaborative models without adequate training; lack of preparation for teachers yields poor outcomes for students and for them.

- New goals for staff development and parent involvement are very important. Staff development could focus on career ladders for paraprofessionals with native language skills.

- Bi-literacy should be seen as a goal rather than a means to an end.

- Long term goals for inclusion should include development of language resources and programs for developmental bilingual education.

- A range of inclusive environments and settings must include the bilingual classroom.

- It is important to know what conditions must be in place for the philosophy of inclusion to be effective, and how to establish those conditions. Important issues include the availability of resources, including technology, and the use of native language.

- The implementation of responsible inclusion policies at the community and school-based v. district must be determined.

2. *Current Knowledge Base*

- A body of research on effective programs exists; however, there is a need to eliminate distance between teachers and others in the education community. Communication among key stakeholders is needed to facilitate this process.

- Parents, bilingual teachers, and all who work with students are important. We cannot create a practitioner who can do it all, but we can train one who can work with others who have expertise to share. Effective collaboration is critical.

- The politics of inclusion through parent involvement must be available to assist

minority parents, who must also be given support to develop within communities.

- Language minority students are often seen as simply low performing. Vocabulary difficulties result in a watered-down curriculum that does not allow these students to make the progress necessary for success.

- When children receive specialized language services, a terminal point is reached and they are *exited* into all-English environments with little transition support.

- Much research in bilingual education has focused on large evaluations of programs, rather than providing specific information for teachers to help them work with kids who are learning English.

- It is important to identify a framework of constructs and solutions from classrooms, for example, active vocabulary instruction; teachers should get to know homes and families, getting support from other experienced teachers in schools.

- Often these constructs can be identified as "just good teaching." This serves to demystify; encourages involvement of students in learning activities.

- It is important to teach strategies which are useful to students and to identify applications in their home and school lives.

- Some teachers are more skilled at "scaffolding"--using a student's skills to bridge to English.

- Latino students learning English usually spend more time on vocabulary and coping strategies. Teachers may determine that the student is a poor reader based on the misinterpretation of this phenomena.

- Less successful bilingual readers draw many fewer conclusions than do successful readers. They need to learn how to integrate what they already know into the text they read.

- More successful bilingual readers have a better attitude about their native language. Less successful readers see the native language as very separate and not helpful to learning in English.

- "Modulating" is active teacher support to help students. Teachers must know when to provide support, when to pull back, etc. "Modulating" is interactive, responsive to student needs, and reflect an understanding of second language learning.

- Preplanning on the part of teachers is needed for literature study. Teachers must understand content at a different level and must know what is needed for second language learners.

Primary level:

- In early literacy, the development of oral language, reading, and writing are really inseparable.

- In the primary grades, there are many non-English proficient students and many teachers are not adequately prepared to teach them.

- Effective practices include:

  - Team teaching with bilingual teachers
  - Incorporating parents and community members into the classroom environment
  - Building language though interaction with adults and other students
  - Using stories, including storytelling from the community with culturally relevant stories

- The use of oral language should be encouraged in both languages.

Intermediate level:

- Use peer-mediated instruction.

- Procedures must have clear goals, must stimulate student-student or student-teacher interaction.

- Provide opportunities to be verbal and stimulate thought.

- Empower teachers to use different procedures.

- Provide tutoring and training for all students; (students learn learning/teaching strategies.

- Heterogeneous grouping; pair LM with bilingual or English proficient students.

Secondary level:

- Many middle school kids with problems in English may look like LD students.
- Teachers must determine previous experience, level of knowledge, and identify curriculum requirements to initiate teaching with a student at their level of understanding.
- Students may have problems with *executive processing* due to the overload they experience when engaging in academic tasks. Specifically, the strain to use standard English may interfere with success. *Executive processing* may be a compounded problem for language minority students with learning disabilities.
- When students have trouble, there is an overburden on *executive processing*. They need scaffolding to monitor process, overt strategies, and points of reference.
- Successful middle school teachers have broken the traditional constructs. Activities from elementary models may provide opportunities for scaffolding, etc. to encourage success.
- Tools for learning include developing concepts in an explicit way initially, then integrating into higher level knowledge and thematic study.
- Use language from a personal perspective to demonstrate critical concepts for later instruction.
- Use demonstrations and modeling.
- Use clear concise consistent language, then branch out.
- Writer's workshop (also from elementary) can be useful to help students flesh out ideas.
- Active involvement continually emerges as an example of an effective construct for teachers in the middle school.
- Feedback and mediation also important.
- At the high school level, many concepts from other areas also apply. Transfer and knowledge utilization are similar to previous research results. Teachers must share responsibility for language minority students.

- Encourage student self-assessment and responsibility for own learning.

- Peer interaction and peer-mediated instruction gives students opportunities to verbalize.

- Academic needs of linguistically diverse high school students include:

    - Academic rather than social language
    - More instructional time
    - Targeted tutoring after school and during summer

    - Subject matter knowledge and skills to correct mismatch of previous curriculum and current expectations
    - Appropriate learning strategies and guidelines for selecting those strategies
    - Self-efficacy in an academic context

- Teachers need to recognize delays in education in student's native language.

- Important elements for effective instruction:

    - Climate of school
    - Shared responsibility
    - High expectations for all students
    - Classroom organization and management
    - Understanding what strengths students bring to classroom
    - Classroom as a community of learners

- Teachers need expertise in:

    - How to use student's prior knowledge
    - Assessment and how to make it more authentic;(eg. portfolios).
    - Planning which takes time and can result in long-term growth and greater competence over time.
    - Finding and using available resources.

B. Future Project FORUM Activities Resulting from the Forum

Discussion centered around a second forum proposed for March, 1995 to share information with other stakeholders. That meeting would include SEA and LEA representatives, teachers, and parents as well as the research group. Joy Hicks agreed to follow up this proposal to see if it will fit into the Project FORUM work plan for the coming year. Russell Gersten will follow up with Lou Danielson at OSEP.

APPENDIX A

Participant List

Participant List

A Policy Forum on Inclusion and the Role of Special Education in Restructuring: Focus on Language Minority Students
September 18-19, 1994

Carolyn Adger
Center for Applied Linguistics
1118 22nd Street, NW
Washington, DC 20037
Phone: 301/622-4295(h)
Phone: 202/429-9292(w)
Fax: 301/622-4295(h)

Carmen Arreaga-Mayer
Juniper Gardens Children's Project
1614 Washington Boulevard
Kansas City, KS 66102
Phone: 913/321-3143 (w)
913/341-5593 (h)
Fax: 913/371-8522

Leonard Baca
Bueno Center for Multicultural Education
Campus Box 249
University of Colorado
Boulder, CO 80309
Phone: 303/492-5416
Fax: 303/492-2883

Candace Bos
University of Arizona
Department of Special Education
and Rehabilitation
College of Education
Tucson, AZ 85721
Phone: 602/621-3214 (w)
602/742-1231 (h)
Fax: 602/621-3821

Anna Chamot
Georgetown University
Language Resource Program
Suite 207
1916 Wilson Boulevard
Arlington, VA 22201
Phone: 703/351-9500
Fax: 703/351-9650

Ji-Mei Chang
Department of Special Education
and Rehabilitation Services
San Jose State University
San Jose, CA 95195-0078
Phone: 408/924-3705 (w)
408/946-6645 (h)
Fax: 408/924-3713

Jozi De Leon
New Mexico State University
Department 3SPE
P.O. Box 30001
Las Cruces, NM 88003
Phone: 505/646-4234 or 2402
Fax: 505/646-7712

Russell Gersten
Eugene Research Institute
Suite C
1400 High Street
Eugene, OR 97401
Phone: 503/342-1553
Fax: 503/342-4310

Anne Graves
San Diego State University
Special Education Department
San Diego, CA 92182
Phone: 619/594-6616
Fax: 619/594-6628

Marie Hughes
University of Miami
School of Education
P.O. Box 248065
Coral Gables, FL 33124
Phone: 305/284-6611
Fax: 305/284-3003

Robert Jiménez
Eugene Research Institute
Suite C
1400 High Street
Eugene, OR 97401
Phone: 503/342-1553 or 346-1459
Fax: 503/342-4310

Beatriz Mitchell
OSERS
U.S. Department of Education
MES Building, Room 3122
330 C Street, SW
Washington, DC 20202
Phone: 202/205-9293
Fax: 202/205-9252

Francesca Reilly-McDonald
Arlington Public Schools
Yorktown High School
5201 North 28th Street
Arlington, VA 22207
Phone: 703/358-5433
Fax: 703/358-5430

Linda Smith
Yorktown High School
5201 North 28th Street
Arlington, VA 22207
Phone: 703/358-5392
Fax: 703/358-5430

Joann Starks
Dept. of Educ. Administration
EDB 310
The Univ. of Texas at Austin
Austin, TX 78712
Phone: 512/471-7551
Fax: 512/471-5975

Barbara Wells
OBEMLA
U.S. Department of Education
600 Independence Avenue, SW
Washington, DC 20202-6642
Phone: 202/205-5463
Fax: 202/205-8737

Sharon Vaughn
University of Miami
School of Education
P.O. Box 248065
Coral Gables, FL 33124
Phone: 305/284-6611
Fax: 305/284-3003

Janice Chavez
Dept. of Counseling & Spec. Ed.
Calif. State University, Fresno
5005 N. Maple Ave.
Fresno, CA 93740-0003
Phone: 209-278-0293
Fax: 209-278-0404

OSEP
Jane Williams
OSEP
U.S. Department of Education
Switzer Building, Room 3529
400 Maryland Avenue, SW
Washington, DC 20202-2641
Phone: 202/205-9039
Fax: 202/205-8105 or 9070

OBEMLA
Gabriela Uro
OBEMLA
U.S. Department of Education
MES Building, Room 5082
330 C Street, SW
Washington, DC 20202-6510

Josefina Velasco
OBEMLA
U.S. Department of Education
MES Building, Room 5082
330 C Street, SW
Washington, DC 20202-6510

Desiree Espinoza
OBEMLA
U.S. Department of Education
MES Building, Room 5082
330 C Street, SW
Washington, DC 20202-6510

Project FORUM at NASDSE
Joy Hicks
NASDSE
1800 Diagonal Rd., Ste. 320
Alexandria, VA 22314
Phone: 703-519-3800
Fax: 703-519-3808

OCR
Lepa Tomic
Office for Civil Rights
Switzer Building, Room 5426
330 S Street, SW
Washington, DC 20202
Phone: 202-205-8734

APPENDIX B

Communications with Participants

Dear

We at Project FORUM are very pleased that you have accepted our invitation to participate in the Policy Forum entitled, "Issues Related to Inclusion and the Role of Special Education in Restructuring: Focus on Language Minority Students". This Forum will examine the critical issues in providing quality instruction to students with limited knowledge of English in the general education classroom. The goal is to present a series of guidelines that can help inform policymakers and practitioners as they consider plans for the inclusion of language minority students.

Forum participants will identify and develop guidelines about specific issues; e.g., contemporary research on strategies for enhancing English language ability and competence through language-sensitive content instruction; techniques used in special education such as cooperative learning reciprocal teaching; procedures using peers, siblings, community volunteers and parents to provide native language support; techniques for involving parents in a meaningful way to support and inform instruction; etc.

The Policy Forum will be held Sunday, September 18, 1994 (4:00 p.m. to 5:30 p.m.) and Monday, September 19, 1994 from 9:00 a.m. until 4:15 p.m. We will be meeting at the Holiday Inn, Old Town, Alexandria, VA, where a room will be reserved in your name for Sunday and Monday nights. A continental breakfast will be available both mornings, and lunch will be provided on Monday.

Project FORUM will pay your travel and per diem expenses for this meeting. Your room and room tax will be billed to NASDSE. If you book your transportation through NASDSE's travel agent, that bill will also be sent directly to us. We would appreciate it if you could stay over Saturday night (September 17) to get the cheaper airfare. NASDSE would cover the expense of the additional night at the hotel. Other expenses, such as taxis or airport parking, will be reimbursed after the meeting.

In order to make your travel reservations, please call Katrina Garvey at UniGlobe Travel (1-800-247-8824 or 703-684-8824) and tell her that you are attending the Policy Forum at NASDSE on Language Minority Students. The ticket will be sent directly to you.

Prior to the meeting, you will be receiving background materials relevant to this Forum's topic, a preliminary agenda, and additional information on your accommodations.

All of us on the staff of Project FORUM are looking forward to working with you on this topic of language minority students. If you have any questions, please call Ms. Joy

Hicks at 703-519-3800. At your earliest convenience, please complete and fax or send the attached form regarding the specifics of your travel plans and any special provisions you might require.

Sincerely,

Joy Hicks, Director
Project FORUM

Please Fax or Send to:

Project FORUM
National Association of State Directors of Special Education
1800 Diagonal Road, Suite 320
Alexandria, Virginia 22314

Fax: (703) 519-3808 (Telephone: 703-519-3800)

Name: 1

I will ____ I will not____ be able to attend the Forum, "Issues Related to Inclusion and the Role of Special Education in Restructuring: Focus on Language Minority Students", on September 18-19, at the Holiday Inn-Old Town, Alexandria, VA.

I will need a room for the nights of: (Please Check)

September 17 _____
September 18 _____
September 19 _____

In addition, I will need the following special travel/meeting arrangements:

_____

_____

Note: Please make your airline reservations directly with UniGlobe Travel Agency (1-800-247-8824 or 703-684-8824).

APPENDIX C

Agenda

AGENDA

A POLICY FORUM ON INCLUSION AND THE ROLE OF SPECIAL EDUCATION IN RESTRUCTURING: FOCUS ON LANGUAGE MINORITY STUDENTS SEPTEMBER 18-19, 1994

Sunday, September 18

4:00 - 5:30	Overview & Planning for Policy Forum *Russell Gersten*
5:30 - 6:30	Reception

Monday, September 19

8:00 - 9:00	Breakfast
9:00 - 9:30	Opening Remarks *Joy Hicks* *Russell Gersten* *Beatriz Mitchell*
9:30 - 10:30	Key Issues *Leonard Baca* *Sharon Vaughn* *Janice Chavez*
10:30 - 10:45	Break
10:45 - 12:30	Discussion of Current Knowledge Base and Some Key Findings

- Understanding Effective Instruction for Language Minority Students in Easing the Transition into English Instruction
  Robert Jimenez
  Russell Gersten
- Primary/Early Literacy
  Jozi De Leon
- Upper Elementary Transition into English
  Carmen Arreaga-Mayer
- Middle School-Focus on Writing
  Anne Graves

- High School
  Anna Chamot
  Linda Smith

12:30 - 1:30 Lunch

1:30 - 3:30 Discussion of Relevant Issues

- Teacher Training and Issues Related to Dialects and Languages Other Than Spanish
  Candace Bos
  Anna Chamot
  Ji-Mei Chang
  Carolyn Adger

- Collaborations Between Special Education and Bilingual Education and Other Programs
  Sharon Vaughn

- Using the Family (including siblings) and Community as a Source of Support
  Ji-Mei Chang

- Critical Issues for Inclusion: A Return to Issues Raised Earlier in Light of the Knowledge Base
  Leonard Baca
  Sharon Vaughn
  Russell Gersten

3:30 - 4:00 Next Steps
Joy Hicks
Russell Gersten

APPENDIX D

Materials Shared by Participants

Janice A. Chavez

EDUCATIONAL REFORM/INCLUSION ISSUES FOR THE LANGUAGE MINORITY STUDENT IN SPECIAL EDUCATION

Thomas M. Skric - Harvard Educational Review Equity and Educational Excellence

ISSUES IN EDUCATIONAL REFORM:

* eliminating scientific management as the approach to administration and change
* merge general and special education systems
* eliminate specialization, professionalization, and loose coupling - the structural contingence of the professional bureaucracy configuration
* as long as resources are constant and students differ, no teacher, whether in a general or special education classroom, can escape the necessary choice between excellence (higher class means) and equity (narrow class variances), unless more powerful instructional technologies
* structural contingencies of rationalization and formalization circumscribe a finite set of resources relative to a specified set of activities and outcomes, while those of specialization and professionalization circumscribe a finite repertoire of standard programs relative to a finite set of presumed client needs
* students whose needs fall on the margins or outside the standard programs must be either squeezed into them or squeezed out of the classroom
* given the inevitability of human diversity, a professional bureaucracy can do nothing but create students who do not fit the system
* in a professional bureaucracy, all forms of tracking - curriculum tracking and in-class ability grouping in general education, as well as self contained and resource classrooms in special, compensatory, remedial and gifted education - are organizational pathologies created by specialization and professionalization and compounded by rationalization and formalization. Students are subjected to - and subjugated by these practices because, given their structural and cultural contingencies, traditional **school organizations cannot accommodate diversity and so must screen it out**
* by retaining the notion of a classroom, they retain a specialized division of labor, a professionalized means of coordination, and thus a loosely coupled form of interdependency
* professional bureaucracy unites theory into practice in the individual professional rather than in a team of professionals
* in structural and cultural terms, school organizations cannot be adhocratic - and thus cannot be excellent, equitable, or democratic - **without the uncertainty of student diversity**

S. Stainback and W. Stainback (1992)

"General education is as much to blame as special education because . . . 'special' education has operated for so long, many schools unfortunately do not know...how to adapt and modify the curriculum and instructional programs to meet diverse student needs" (p. 40). To at least some exclusionists, then, special education's very existence is responsible for general education's failure to accommodate the needs of many students, because it has served as a "dumping ground" that has made it easy for general education to rid itself of its "undesirables" and "unteachables". Moreover, some critics contend, if providing the mainstream with a dumping ground were not complicity enough, special education's tendency to locate students' learning and behavior problems within the child (see S. Stainback & W. Stainback, 1992), p. 32) has absolved general educators of responsibility for the children they have removed from their system. Eliminating special education, say the full inclusionists, will force general educators both to deal with the children it heretofore had avoided and, in the process, to transform itself into a more responsive, resourceful, humane system.

Fuchs and Fuchs (1994)

Inclusive schools mean...decentralization of power and the concomitant empowerment of teachers and building-level administrators; a fundamental reorganization of the teaching and learning process through innovations like cooperative learning and thematic teaching; and the redefinition of professional relationships within buildings

Literacy Support across Multiple Sites: Experiences of Chinese American LEP children in Inner Cities

Ji-Mei Chang, Ph.D.
College of Education
San Jose State University

Grace Fung, Ph.D.
Multifunctional Resource Center
Hunter College of City University of New York

Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of American Educational Research Association (AERA), April 5, 1994, New Orleans, LA.

The current comparative analysis of the social, language, and literacy environments of home, school, community of two selected groups of Chinese American limited English Proficient (LEP) children in California and New York was built on a previous research project funded by the U.S. Office of Special Education Programs (Chang, 1993a; Chang and Maldonado-Colon, 1994). The findings regarding language and literacy learning beyond school among a group Chinese LEP children who were at-risk of academic failure and were identified by their schools as learning disabled (LEP+LD) as well, has led to further investigations of the types of community-based multiple sites of learning, and how accessible these learning opportunities are to different groups of Chinese LEP children across the cities and country.

The importance of multiple sites of learning and their roles in sustaining Chinese LEP+LD children's school learning has evolved through a home-school-community-based conceptualization of LEP+LD children and field research conducted in California (Chang, 1993a). The research findings suggested that Chinese LEP+LD children who had social and literacy support from at least two components of home, school, and community, tended to sustain their school learning. Thus the term, "multiple sites of learning" includes any site where LEP children engaged in types of activities that (a) enhanced their ability to complete teacher assigned homework, (b) provided opportunities for them to borrow books or reading newspapers and magazines, and listen to stories, (c) helped them acquire or learn English language, (d) engaged them in field trips to expand their social and learning experiences, (e) involved them to discuss experiences and events, (f) allowed them to acquire information from hands-on activities, and/or (g) introduced them different genre of Chinese children literature, for

example, rhymes, folktales, stories, and narratives as well as culture, value, and Chinese written language. The findings also indicated that literacy learning beyond school in various community-based sites enhanced LEP+LD children's maintenance of academic skills when their LEP parents were unable to assist them in completing homework assignments.

Based on student files and field observations, many Chinese LEP children participated in the California study were once perceived as at-risk of academic failure, particularly in the areas of reading and language arts, before they were formally placed in special education. Hence, the New York study was launched in an attempt to broaden the database regarding Chinese LEP children who were perceived by teachers to risk academic failure, and the natures and types of multiple sites of learning that may exist within Chinese American communities in inner cities across the country. It is obvious that there are differences between LEP+LD students and LEP students who are at risk of further academic failure (LEP+At-Risk). It is important to note that the focus of this comparative analysis is not on the nature of LD or at-riskness of the LEP children but on the types of social, language, and literacy support structures these two group of children might have.

Through a systematic research effort to expand research database to include Chinese LEP+At-Risk children from another inner city environment may help researchers to (1) expand the definition of literacy to include a view which values literacy as practices, not skills, (2) further validate the concept of multiple literacy and the roles of the multiple sites of learning may play in LEP children's school learning, and (3) conceptualize ways in which these community-based sites can be an integral part of their formal schooling. The aforementioned domains are particularly important given the limited school resources and shortage of bilingual school personnel we currently experienced. Information about support structure across home, school, and community these inner city Chinese children may have is important because many of them needed specific school support in order not to risk academic failure. Hence, the focus of this comparative analysis is not on the nature of LD or at-riskness of the LEP children but on the types of social, language, and literacy support structures these two group of children might have.

The purpose of this presentation is to illustrate the types of social and literacy support structures available to Chinese LEP children from working families who lived in inner city communities. In this paper the literacy support structures are illustrated in the form

of various activity settings where these children were exposed to literacy. It is our hope that teachers, parents, and community advocates who serve inner city LEP children will collaborate across sites in schools and communities to generate literacy experiences and social capital (cf., Coleman, 1987; Goodlad, 1992; Chang, 1993b) for LEP children's academic success. This is particularly important to those who are living in poverty and at-risk of school failure. Social capital is broadly defined as the means by which LEP children's social, language and literacy development is generated through a network of peers, immediate and/or extended family members, adult, librarians, community informants, specialists, and teachers in an LEP child's home, school, and community-based multiple sites of learning (Chang, Lai, and Shimizu, 1994).

Theoretical Framework The present study is guided by two major theoretical frameworks. The first framework is formed by theories relevant to individuals with learning/reading disabilities, specifically, an interactive perspective on reading disabilities (Lipson & Wixson, 1986) and ecological way of examining learning and reading disabilities (Bartoli & Botel, 1988). Theories represented by Lipson and Wixson, as well as Bartoli and Botel, proposed that reading or learning disabilities are a complex phenomenon. The interactive effects among external factors, such as poverty, instructional approaches, and/or levels of literacy support coupled with the individual's internal factors, such as diagnosed deficits in auditory or visual information processing abilities, attitudes, and learning styles, etc., will contribute to the success or failure of developing adequate reading or learning abilities.

The second framework is based on the social constructive model which explain how the at-risk status can be jointly constructed within a nested context of district, school, and classroom (Richardson, Casanova, Placier, & Guilfoyle, 1989). Guided by this model, the study of Chinese LEP children who were considered at-risk of academic failure, with or without school identified learning disabilities, focused beyond LEP children and examined into how the perceived at-riskness and/or learning disabilities might have been socially constructed by students, teachers, classroom environment, home, and their community.

Methodology The present comparative study between two inner cities, guided by an integrated framework, has directed the researchers to incorporate qualitative methodologies, such as observations and interviews. The researchers attempted to extend Richardson et al's (1989) work to examine a group of Chinese LEP children who

were perceived as at-risk of academic failure by their homeroom teachers. The research activities for California study was conducted during 1990 through 1993 school years (Chang and Maldonado-Colon, 1994), and the New York study was launched in 1993-1994 school years. The New York study used a *Home Language and Literacy Environment Survey* (Chang and Maldonado-Colon, 1991) to collect data. This survey form was constructed and field tested in the original study in California as a means to collect self-reported information and perception. Many of the interview items were open-ended questions to cover various topics related to the types of literacy activities and the language(s) in which the target children engaged in beyond schools. Two separate forms of the survey tools, sharing many identical items, were administered separately to target children and their parent(s) in different settings and times. The use of two comparable survey forms in the studies helped the researchers to cross-validate self-reported information and perceptions obtained from the child and their parent(s). The data analysis was guided primarily by Spradley's (1979; 1981) framework. This report focused on a part of the study which revealed the pattern of types of literacy settings in these children's community.

Data Sources The subjects employed in the present comparative analysis were the two groups of LEP children enrolled in large urban school districts where there was a high percentage of Chinese-American students in California and New York. Given the nature of in-depth analysis of LEP children's total language and literacy environment, a selected group of 16 Chinese LEP+LD children from the original study conducted in California and 16 LEP+At-Risk children from New York were included. Both groups of Chinese LEP children were (1) either American born in the U.S., China, Hong Kong, or Southeast Asia, (2) came from a low SES home environment (based on participation of free or reduced lunch program and school report), (3) were enrolled in third- through fifth-grade, and (4) may or may not have received speech-language therapy or counseling services.

Specific selection criteria for LEP+LD children in California study were those who (1) have met the school district guidelines for LD placement in a pull-out special education LD resource program, and (2) were Cantonese-speakers and met school district guidelines as LEP. Specific criteria that designated them as LEP were those who had not met all of the following criteria: (a) scored above 36th percentile on California Test of Basic Skills (CTBS) Achievement tests; (b) obtained grades at or higher than "C" in major subject matter areas in student report card; (c) rated by classroom teacher at or above level 4 in

Language Observation Matrix (SOLOM), constructed by California State Department of Education; (d) scored at or above expected level in formal tests of English Oral Language; and (e) scored at or higher than level 3 in their writing samples. Most of these LEP+LD children have been rated at or above level 4 in SOLOM by their homeroom teachers, but rated much lower by their LD resource specialists in the same items.

In general, they all scored below 36% in CTBS and expected levels of other forms of formal tests of English oral language. Essentially, for LEP children to be placed in special education LD resource program, they have, in general, developed sufficient basic interpersonal communicative skills (BICS) in English, but not in their cognitive/academic language proficiency (CALP) in English. However, they all had a much lower level of proficiency in their home language, Chinese, as judged by LEP children themselves, their parents, and school psychologists. Very few of them could read or write in Chinese, and most of them had neither formal instruction in learning nor daily use of Chinese written language.

Subjects employed in the New York study were a group of ethnic Chinese LEP children who were at-risk of academic failure (or **LEP+At-Risk**). The working definition of LEP+At-Risk is based on those Chinese LEP children who were referred by their homeroom teachers to a School-Based Support Team for pre-referral intervention due to their failing academic performance. Because these LEP+At-Risk children scored high enough in initial screening assessment, they were not considered for special education referral. However, these children continued to be viewed as at-risk of academic failure by their homeroom teachers due to these children's limited proficiency in English.

Specific subject selection criteria for **LEP+At-Risk** children were those who (1) were speakers of a variety of Chinese dialects, for example, Cantonese, Mandarin (Putonghua), Toisanese, and Foochowese, and (2) had been referred by a homeroom teacher to School-Based Support Team but were not recommended for special education referral. <u>The designated criteria for them to be LEP</u> were (a) those children whose home language was not English, and (b) those who scored at or below 40th percentile on New York City Language Assessment Battery. In addition, the LEP+At-Risk children from mixed Chinese dialect groups were chosen to reflect the reality of student make-up of Chinese LEP student population within many parts of inner city schools across the country. It is interesting to note that criteria designating a child's "LEP" status varied greatly across the states. The profile of selected characteristics of these research subjects is presented in

(Chang & Fung, 1994, Page 5)

Table 1.

Insert Table 1 Here

Results and Discussion The selected issues incorporated in the comparative analysis between the two inner city Chinese communities are primarily based on data obtained from the Phase One of the New York study and the original study conducted in California. Interviews of Chinese LEP children and their parents were recorded in the form of Home *Language and Literacy Environment Survey* (Chang and Maldonado-Colon, 1991). The scheme for data coding and analysis was guided by a cognitive anthropological view of culture (Spradly, 1980) to locate the types of literacy related-activities, language, space, objects, actors, and feelings that are involved per designated time and events. The purpose was to use a descriptive matrix to reveal patterns of events or activities in which each of the LEP children may become engaged beyond school in three time slots: before and after school, weekends, and holiday. The results and discussion will be organized per specific research questions that guided the Phase One of the comparative analysis.

Question 1: What are the similarities and differences among the Chinese LEP children who participated in the study in the areas of home language, language preference, and perception of school subject matters?

Within the group of LEP+LD children, six out of 16 children preferred to use English, but none of the LEP+At-Risk children indicated that English was the only preferred language. Five out of 16 in the LEP+LD group and seven out of 12 in the LEP+At-Risk group preferred to use both Chinese and English languages during their daily communication and studies. In comparison, the California group had much better command in English BICS than the New York group.

Many of the LEP children who participated in the two studies reported their home language as "Chinese" rather than a specific dialect until researchers further questioned them to identify specific types of Chinese dialect being used at home. Furthermore, it was intentional to include speakers of various types of Chinese dialects in New York study in order to provide preliminary data on similarities or differences of the profiles of multiple sites of learning currently existing within inner city Chinese communities. Regarding each child's perception of school subject matters, a majority of children indicated that

math was easiest, particularly for LEP+At-Risk children. One of the probable speculations of this response may be that math is usually taught in their native language which leads to a more comprehensive way to study this subject.

Question 2: What are the social and literacy support structures that inner city Chinese American LEP children may have in school, home, and their community as revealed in these interviews?

Information presented in Table 2 reflects a composite of multiple sites of learning based on responses to survey items. Social, language, and literacy support structure will be explained on the basis of children's involvement in these multiple sites of learning. These LEP children were primarily served within three types of homerooms: mainly bilingual, English language development, and English-only. It was clear that not all Chinese LEP children received native language instruction as previously reported in the California data. By the nature of their LEP+LD, these children had all been served in a pull-out special education LD resource program, usually 30 to 45 minutes per day, three or four times a week. A large portion of them, nine out of 16 children, had also received another type of pull-out speech-language therapy concurrently, usually once or twice a week for approximately 30 minutes per session. All of the LEP+At-Risk children attended bilingual classes, however ten out of 12 children were also pulled out to receive additional ESL instruction three or four times a week for approximately 30-40 minutes per session.

Insert Table 2 Here

The survey responses revealed a very consistent pattern of mother's involvement in their children's homework activities regardless of their social economic status (SES) and level of education. Even among the less educated parents, they arranged for either a sibling or community-based after school program to supervise their child's schoolwork. Almost all of the parents who participated in the California and New York studies emphasized the importance of their child completing his/her homework. Some of the parents assigned additional work after their child completed teacher assigned work, most of them in math.

After school programs varied by types and sponsors. The extent to which each family utilized these programs and services are also varied greatly from both the California and

New York research samples. Even though there were various types of literacy support structures provided by school and community, not all LEP children in the current study attended the services. In addition, it was noted that most of LEP+LD children dropped out of Chinese language school after they were placed in special education. It was a general feeling among the teachers being interviewed that attending Chinese language school may be an overburden to the LEP child with LD.

Question 3: What are the similarities and differences between LEP+LD and LEP+At risk children's school-home-community-based language and literacy environment between inner cities in California and New York?

The similarities and differences in LEP+LD and LEP+At risk children's school-home-community-based language and literacy environment will be analyzed through three major support systems generated from school, home, and community. The types of school interventions varied accordingly in the school support system because of the differences in their levels of English language proficiency. For example, the LEP+LD children had, in general, mastered BICS, as indicated in teachers' rating. Based special education intervention, their pull-out tended to focus on remediation of basic academic skills, however none of them received ESL support. Furthermore, the LEP+At-Risk group of children received pull-out based ESL support to improve their oral language comprehension to reinforce their ability to listen and speak English.

Based on the data collected through Phase One of the study one school support system may be synthesized from their responses to survey items that asked them how often they received help from their peers for school work. The synthesized data suggested that both LEP+LD and LEP +At-Risk children had similar school support systems that utilized peers. The types of peer mediation generated from interaction included providing clues or examples for homework completion, extending teachers' instructions, or telephoning one another for specific assignments. It can be expected that this type of peer generated mediation contributed to LEP children's language and literacy development (Vygotsky, 1978). It is also worthwhile noting that regardless the types of Chinese dialect spoken at home, many LEP+At-Risk children had acquired Cantonese and/or Mandarin through peer interactions at school and in the community.

A striking commonalty existed in two aspects of LEP+LD and LEP+At-Risk children's home support system. The first aspect of home support reflected parents' commitment

to their child's education. Two major similarities surfaced from the findings within this aspect of the analysis. The first similarity was that Chinese parents' commitment to their child's homework. Many of these inner city Chinese parents demanded that their child's school teachers assigned more homework. For some LEP parents, their commitment to find ways to supervise their child's school work constituted their ultimate contribution to their child's school education.

The second similarity within the first aspect was that regardless how effective of the types of homeroom or special services Chinese LEP children received, Chinese parents in both cities expressed their appreciation of schools and teachers; perhaps, such an appreciation for teachers and schools reflected one of the distinctive features in Chinese culture. Parents valued teachers who made extra effort to communicate with them and to help their child. The quality of the teachers perceived by the parents was teachers' patience, and their consistency in assigning, correcting, and returning students' homework. For a majority of these parents, teachers are still respected as learned figures as revered in the traditional Chinese culture. Even in a new country facing a new challenge of different school system, this belief seemed to remain unchanged.

The second aspect of home support system is summarized in Figure 1, coded from child and parents' responses to specific survey items that asked them to describe the types of literacy activities they participated at home after school, on weekends, or in holidays. The term, literacy activity, was broadly defined to include any activities that LEP children engaged in provided them with opportunities to listen, speak, read, or write in either home or English languages. The frequently described literacy activities and/or events reported by both groups of parents and LEP children were similar as follows:

(Chang & Fung, 1994, Page 9)

Figure 1. A composite of literacy activities and/or events occurring after school, weekends, and holidays

California Study	New York Study
Parents assign extra or additional homework*.	Parents assign extra or additional homework.
Buying and reading:	Buying and reading:
-Chinese newspaper	-Chinese newspaper
-Comics* & books*	-Comics* & books*
-English & Chinese magazines.	-English & Chinese magazines.
Shopping and reading* advertisement	Shopping and reading advertisement*
Eating out and reading English and Chinese menu.	Eating out and reading English and Chinese menu.
Story telling with parents* and siblings.*	Story telling with parents and siblings.
Watching TV with parents. both Chinese and English Programs.	Watching TV with parents. both Chinese & English programs.

*Activities often carried out in both home and English languages.

Based on preliminary findings on the community support system, the data indicated that the multiple sites of learning existed in both communities (See Table 2). The most common after school programs were all related to support LEP children's school work. However, the extent of each LEP child's participation at these sites in either community varied. It is plausible to suggest that the Chinese community maintained and reinforced the value of school education, particularly in the form of supervising homework.

Summary. The emphasis of school education and the importance of homework expressed by Chinese parents can be expected across different parts of the country regardless of parents level of education, social economic status, and types of dialects they spoke. These Chinese parents cared for their child's education, and many of them made homework supervision their first priority in daily life. They sought support to assist their child's school work and appreciated teachers' effort. Even within the group of LEP+LD children when a majority of their special education was not tailored to support their child's English and home language development, Chinese parents continued to support and appreciate all teachers who were involved in their child's school education.

(Chang & Fung, 1994, Page 10)

The social value of education within the community reflected in the forms of providing various types of after school tutorial services. Based on data obtained from two groups of Chinese LEP children from California and New York, literacy learning experiences can be acquired through the multiple sites of learning beyond schools.

Educational Implications. The present analysis revealed that the multiple sites of learning do exist across inner city Chinese communities. The patterns of various literacy settings where Chinese children were exposed to literacy and the types of literacy activities they engaged in after school as well as on weekends and holidays support the view that literacy will need to be viewed as practices not as skills that only taught in school curriculum. The findings showed that various literacy practices are already provided for inner city Chinese LEP children in places other than school.

Given the limited school resources and extreme shortage of bilingual teachers and support personnel most school currently experienced, teachers, parents, educators, community advocates, administrators, and related human service providers may need to reach out and collaborate in their efforts across home, school, and community. These professionals who serve inner city Chinese/Asian LEP children can generate social, language, and literacy support for LEP children's academic success. As indicated in Chang's (1993a; 1993b) study, having literacy support generated from any two of the home, school, and community, some of the Chinese LEP+LD children were likely to sustain academic progress. That is, literacy support can be generated by individual teachers, parents, or community instructional personnel or librarians who were willing to form a team to collaborate across either school-home, home-community and community-school. In sum, this support is critical for those LEP children who (1) are at-risk of school failure, identified as learning disabled, living in poverty and/or in non-mainstreamed working environment where English is not the dominant language, and (2) have missing social structure(s) in one or more of the home, school, and community support systems.

(Chang & Fung, 1994, Page 11)

References

Bartoli, J., & Botel, M. (1988). Reading/Learning Disability: An ecological approach. NY: Teachers College Press.

Chang, J.M. (1993a). A School-Home-Community-Based Conceptualization of LEP Students with Learning Disabilities: Implications from a Chinese-American Study. In J. Gomez, and O. Shabak (Eds.). The Proceedings of Third Annual Research Symposium on Limited English Proficient Students' Issues: Focus on evaluation and measurement, Vol. II (pp 693-717). Office of Bilingual Education and Language Minority Affairs, U. S. Department of Education.

Chang, J.M. (1993b) Asian LEP children in special education: A need for multidimensional collaboration. Manuscript submitted to the Proceedings of conference on embracing diversity in the delivery of rehabilitation and related services. Sponsored by the Research and Training Center for access to rehabilitation & Economic Opportunity, Howard University.

Chang, J.M., Lai, A., & Shimizu, W. (1994). Profiles of Chinese LEP children in special education pull-out resources programs. Manuscript of a book chapter to be published by Singular Press.

Chang, J.M. & Maldonado-Colon, E. (1991). Home Language and Literacy Environment Survey. A research tool developed for The comparative study of learning and language disabilities across Chinese and Hispanic language minority groups, Funded by U. S. Office of Special Education Program (Grant #H02310500).

Chang, J.M. & Maldonado-Colon, E. (1994). Final Report: A comparative study of learning and language disabilities across Chinese and Hispanic language minority groups (Grant #H02310500). Final report submitted to the Office of Special Education Programs, U. S. Department of Education.

Coleman, J. S. (1987). Families and schools. Educational Researcher, 16(6), 32-38.

Goodlad, J. (1992). On taking school reform seriously. Kappan, 74(3), 232-238.

Lipson M. Y., & Wixson, K. K. (1986). Reading disability Research: An interactionist perspective. Review of Educational Research, 56(1), 111-136.

Richardson, V., Casanova, U., Placier, P., & Guilfoyle, K. (1989). School children at-risk. New York: The Falmer Press.

Spradly, J. P. (1979). The ethnographic interview. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Spradly, J. P. (1980). Participant Observation. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). Mind and society. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Table 1: Profile of Selected Characteristics of Research Subjects across West and East Coast

			LEP+LD Children California			LEP+At-Risk Children New York		
Grade Level:			**Third** N=5	**Fourth** N=4	**Fifth** N=7	**Third** N=5	**Fourth** N=4	**Fifth** N=7
Gender:			**1F 4M**	**4M**	**4F 3M**	**3F 2M**	**3M 1F**	**4F 3M**
Child's Self-Reported Home Language(s):								
Cantonese			0	1	1	1	2	6
Mandarin (Putonghua)			0	0	0	1	0	0
Toisanese			0	0	0	0	0	1
Foochowese			0	0	0	3	1	0
English and Cantonese			5	3	6	0	1	0
Child's Self-Reported Language Preference:								
Chinese			0	0	2	4	2	3
English*			2*	2*	2*	0	0	0
Chinese and English			2	2	1	1	2	4
Don't know			1	0	0	0	0	0
Child's Perception of School Subject Matter:								
Math	Easy		3	3	2	2	4	4
		Hard	1	1	2	0	0	0
Science	Easy		1	0	0	0	0	1
		Hard	2	1	0	1	1	0
Social Studies	Easy		0	1	0	0	0	0
		Hard	2	0	4	0	0	0
Language Related	Easy		1	1	4	1	0	1
		Hard	1	3	4	6	5	6

*Many of these LEP+LD children were more fluent in English than in Chinese language.

Chang, J.M., & Fung, G. (1994) Literacy Support across Multiple Sites: Experiences of Chinese American LEP children in Inner Cities. Paper presented at the annual meeting of AERA, April 5, 1994, New Orleans, LA.

Table 2: Profile of Multiple Sites of Learning among Chinese LEP Children in Inner Cities

	LEP+LD Children California			LEP+At-Risk Children New York		
Grade Level:	**Third** N=5	**Fourth** N=4	**Fifth** N=7	**Third** N=5	**Fourth** N=4	**Fifth** N=7
Types of Homeroom:						
Bilingual Class	3	2	2	5	4	7
English Language Development class	1	0	2	0	0	0
English-Only Class	1	4	3	0	0	0
Types of Special Services:						
Pull-out ESL program	0	0	0	3	4	7
Pull-out LD Resource Program	5	4	7	0	0	0
Pull-out Speech-language therapy	5	4	3	1	0	0
Counseling	1	1	1	0	0	0
After School Home Activities:						
Homework supervised by mother	3	3	3	4	2	7
Homework supervised by sibling	2	1	4	0	0	0
Weekday After School Programs:						
Chinese school located in public school	1	1	0	3	0	2
Ballet Class	1	0	0	0	0	0
Piano Lesson	1	0	1	0	0	0
Library	1	0	0	2	2	3
For supervision homework:						
Church Program	1	0	0	0	0	1
Private Day Care/tutor	0	1	1	0	1	0
YMCA Program	1	1	0	0	1	0
Chinese Benevolent Association	0	0	0	0	1	1

Chang, J.M., & Fung, G. (1994) Literacy Support across Multiple Sites: Experiences of Chinese American LEP children in Inner Cities. Paper presented at the annual meeting of AERA, April 5, 1994, New Orleans, LA.

Table 2: Profile of multiple sites of learning among Chinese LEP Children in Inner Cities (Con'td)

	LEP+LD Children California			LEP+At-Risk Children New York		
Grade Level:	Third N=5	Fourth N=4	Fifth N=7	Third N=5	Fourth N=4	Fifth N=7
Saturday Programs						
Public school's Saturday Enrichment Program	1	2	0	0	0	0
Chinese Language School	0	1	0	0	0	0
Community-based Field Trip	0	1	0	2	2	3
Sunday Programs						
Church's Sunday School	1	1	0	0	0	1

Chang, J.M., & Fung, G. (1994) Literacy Support across Multiple Sites: Experiences of Chinese American LEP children in Inner Cities. Paper presented at the annual meeting of AERA, April 5, 1994, New Orleans, LA.

Modulating Instruction for Language Minority Students: Implications of Contemporary Research

Russell Gersten
Robert Jiménez
University of Oregon/Eugene Research Institute

Modulating Instruction for Language Minority Students

The current wave of immigration to the U. S. has drastically reshaped the nature of education in this country. The 1990 census revealed that one out of every seven individuals over the age of five grows up speaking a language other than English (Barringer, 1993). One out of every four students in California's schools comes from a home where English is not the primary language.

Providing quality instruction for students for whom English is a second language has become one of the major educational issues of the decade, one with which we are only beginning to grapple (Cziko, 1992; Moll, 1992; De La Rosa & Maw, 1990; Pallas, Natriello & McDill, 1989; Waggoner, 1991). The large number of students involved and the enormity of the problem go beyond training a relatively small cadre of ESL and bilingual specialists. Knowledge of instructional strategies for language minority students is critical to being a successful educator in this country at the present time.

Academic achievement levels for many groups of low income language minority students continue to decline showing few signs of improvement (Pallas, Natriello & McDill, 1990). For example, approximately 35 per cent of all Latino students discontinue their education before completing high school, a figure that has stubbornly remained at this level for over 15 years (Waggoner, 1991). As a result of the surge in immigration, many teachers have become, often by default, teachers of second language students. Teaching this group of students is a complex endeavor. A serious issue is the "double demands" required of language minority students – the need to acquire a second language and, at the same time, master traditional subject matter. Many teachers, confronted with a struggling language minority student, are baffled by the student's seemingly unpredictable rate of academic progress (Gersten & Woodward, in press). Inappropriate referrals into special education are common in some parts of the country (Mercer & Rueda, 1991).

The goal of this chapter is to present promising practices for teaching language minority students and to present a framework that can be used to better understand and analyze the quality of instruction provided. In particular, we aim to present specific procedures for adapting or *adjusting* teaching practices so that they are successful with students for whom English is a second language. Seven years ago, Gersten and Woodward (1985) noted that "bilingual education... (is) relatively easy to write about, yet difficult to implement sensitively on a day to day basis" (p. 78). This chapter highlights key findings from instructional research on language minority students that have relevance for teachers and curriculum developers. Unlike the preceding chapters, we deal less with curriculum per se, and more with how to adapt, curricula in order to sensitively and effectively teach this group of students.

children. This tendency has led many to merely adopt a watered-down curriculum, including reading material well *below* the students' ability to comprehend. This recurrent problem denies language minority children access to the type of instructional material they need in order to make adequate academic progress. This curriculum mismatch, in all likelihood, is one reason for the extremely low academic performance levels of many language minority students.

Often when teachers work with language minority students, there is a tendency to use "brief utterances such as 'What is this?' or 'What color is that?'" Students learn to reply in like form, in one- or two-word utterances. Not surprisingly, little curriculum content or social expectation is communicated in this type of verbal exchange (Fradd, 1987; p. 146). Classroom observations of language minority students conducted by Ramírez (1992) noted the same phenomenon *regardless of teachers' or district's philosophy of bilingual education.*

For years program evaluation research attempted to determine which model of bilingual education produced the highest levels of student academic achievement (Baker & deKanter, 1983; Danoff et al., 1977-1978; Ramirez, 1992; Willig, 1985). A recent synthesis of almost 20 years of program evaluation research by Cziko (1992) concluded, "it may well be unlikely that this question [of which is the best approach for teaching language minority students in the U. S.] will ever be satisfactorily answered regardless of the quantity and quality of additional evaluative research" (p.15).

In addition to the program model comparisons, much of the educational research on language minority students until recently has focused on determining the rate at which English language instruction should be introduced. Many of the recommendations made have emanated from program evaluation efforts, often quite massive in scope (Danoff et al, 1978; Ramirez, 1992). These evaluation efforts were guided at times by theoretical issues, at other times by political issues involving bilingual education (Crawford, 1989; Hakuta, 1986). The heavy emphasis on learning English, to the virtual exclusion of concern for subject matter learning, reflected mainstream fears that language minority communities must be compelled to learn the new language (Cummins, 1986; Willig, 1985).

The type of bilingual program model employed and the language of instruction, while important, has received far more attention in research and in public debate than the equally critical issue of how ideas and concepts are taught. Recently, however, a shift away from searching for the "best" program model has taken place toward research that focuses more on identifying useful and feasible instructional practices (Berman et al., 1992; Hakuta, 1986; Reyes, 1992; Tikunoff, 1985).

how long native language instruction should be maintained (Chamot & O'Malley, 1989; Crawford, 1989; Ramirez, 1992). One thing seems certain – abrupt transitions from virtually all-Spanish to virtually all-English instruction is often detrimental for students (Berman et al, 1992; Ramirez, 1992).

A problem that occurs during the transition years is that teachers often are unable to help students use their cognitive abilities and knowledge developed during the years of native language instruction. It's almost as if students are asked to begin schooling anew in the fifth or sixth grade.

Sheltered English/Structured Immersion: Merging English Language Instruction with Content Learning

Contemporary conceptualizations of education for language minority students acknowledge the participation of many monolingual teachers. Newer approaches, often called sheltered English (Northcutt & Watson, 1986), structured immersion (Baker & deKanter, 1983; Lambert & Tucker, 1972; Gersten & Woodward, 1985) or cognitive-academic language learning (Saville-Troike, 1982; Chamot & O'Malley, 1989), emphasize the merger of English language instruction with content area instruction. Such an approach does not preclude native language instruction. It is currently used most frequently with Southeast Asian students in the elementary grades, and it is increasingly being used with all types of language minority students including Latino students at all grade levels (Chamot & O'Malley, 1989; Ramirez, 1992). This approach is steadily replacing the rather sterile "conversational" ESL instruction that predominated a decade ago.

According to contemporary theorists, understanding of English can be obtained through well-designed content area instruction where English is used, *but at a level that is constantly modulated* (i.e., adjusted and adapted so that it is comprehensible) (Chamot & O'Malley, 1989; Long, 1983). Teachers attempt to control their classroom vocabulary, avoid use of synonyms and idioms, use concrete objects and gestures and visuals such as story maps to enhance student understanding of the essential concepts in academic material.

In sheltered English, teachers do not shy away from teaching age-appropriate concepts such as "migration" to third graders or "peninsula" or "compromise" to sixth or seventh graders. By consciously making instruction highly interactive, affording students many experiences to verbalize their thoughts (even if the grammar or syntax is imperfect), students are able to grasp age-appropriate material.

In an articulate plea for the integration of reading with English language development, Anderson and Roit (1993) note "Spoken language is fleeting and inconsistent over time. Text is stable and does not pass the learner by. It allows one to reread and reconsider that which is to be learned in its original form" (p.2). Anderson & Roit (1993) demonstrate how the "potential reciprocity between learning to read and reading to learn has strong implications for developing oral language in language minority students, even as early as first grade" (p. 1).

students is recognized by researchers (Cazden, 1992; Reyes, 1992; Goldenberg, 1992/1993).

In the remainder of this section, a range of examples of effective instructional practices taken from naturalistic research are presented (Allen, 1989; Au, 1992; Gersten & Jiménez, in press; Gersten, 1993; Goldenberg, 1992-1993; Jiménez & Gersten, 1993; Reyes & Molner, 1991). They focus on language arts/reading because of its centrality in the curriculum of most American schools, and because of its potential to serve as a vehicle for learning English (Anderson & Roit, 1993; Williams & Snipper, 1990).

Another reason for stressing language arts/reading instruction is because this is the area in which language minority students tend to experience the most difficulty. This was revealed both in student interviews (Gersten & Woodward, in press) and in patterns of achievement (de la Rosa & Maw, 1990; Ramirez, 1992) These techniques can – and have – been used in other content areas such as science and social studies (Chamot & O'Malley, 1989).

Merging Language Learning with Reading Instruction

The example below demonstrates how literature and language development can be merged for a group of third graders with very little English proficiency. Constructs 1, 2 and 3 described in Table 1 are in evidence. These students also received native language instruction during a portion of their school day. The example comes from our observational research (Gersten & Jiménez, in press).

The teacher began by reading a story to the class in the form of a big book, Bringing the Rain to Kapiti Plain, by Verna Aardema (1981). She spoke to the students in a clearer, less hurried pace than she used in normal conversation. She also intentionally avoided synonyms. Both of these strategies seemed to really increase students' levels of involvement in the lesson (as judged by eye contact), and most importantly, their comprehension.

After reading two or three pages of the story, she paused to check on their understanding:

Teacher: What does the bow do?
Sipyana: Shoots arrow...

Note that the question is intentionally literal, so that the teacher could assess whether students understood a crucial vocabulary word, *bow*. Because the protagonist of the story is portrayed as a hero who causes rain to fall by shooting a feather from his bow into a cloud, it made sense that some children might benefit from hearing an explanation of this key word (Construct 2 – Relevant background knowledge and key vocabulary concepts).

A second question called for a moderate inference. It elicited a correct but truncated answer from a student:

Teacher: What does he hope will happen when he shoots the arrow?
Tran: The rain (He motions rain falling)
Teacher: Right, the rain will fall down.

Accessing First Language Knowledge During Literacy Instruction

A recent trend has been to develop strategies that teachers can use to activate the skills and strategies that students possess in Spanish and to encourage them to use this knowledge in their English language classrooms (Chamot, 1992). This section contains examples that illustrate the powerful role the use of children's native language can play in teaching and learning. We choose two examples from classrooms where students are beginning to make the transition from Spanish academic instruction to English language content instruction. Note how in both cases students who appear incompetent in an all-English context actually can produce credible responses to teacher requests when given the chance to respond in their native language.

In the first example, a teacher asked her third-grade students to orally report a brief summary of books previously read. She wanted students to provide a one or two sentence general description of the text. The teacher is a fluent speaker of both English and Spanish. The eight-year old child, Ana, stood in front of the class, as did many of her classmates, but she was silent. The teacher's prompts and knowledge of what this child knew and could report appeared to guide her scaffolding (support) construct of this short exchange. In the bilingual excerpt below, the student's Spanish responses to the teacher's English questions are translated into English in italics.

Teacher:	What is it you don't know how to say? Say it in Spanish first.
Ana (Student):	Los niños están asustados porque su abuelito les contó un cuento. (*The children are frightened because their grandfather told them a story.*)
Teacher:	Okay, because grandfather told them a story about a dragon. Was there a real dragon? What happened?
Ana:	Ellos estaban corriendo y se encontraron con sus abuelitos. (*They were running and they met their grandparents.*)
Teacher:	Okay, they were running and they met their grandparents. Do you have anything else to say Ana? Okay, your next book report is going to be in English because I've heard you talk English outside and you do a good job.

A few interesting features of the teacher-student exchange above are that the teacher used only English in her interactions with Ana, even though the exchange could not have occurred without her knowledge of Spanish. Also, the teacher paraphrased Ana's responses in English, and asked questions that attempted to focus Ana's somewhat incomplete statement (Construct 3 – Mediation/Feedback).

In other words, the teacher provided *bilingual scaffolding* (Construct 1 – Structures, Frameworks, Scaffolds and Strategies) to this student. Although Ana spoke in Spanish, she expressed ideas about an English language book

English and use peers to collaboratively develop a response that both the teachers and students can understand.

Finding ways to adequately assess student knowledge and abilities in complex cognitive domains is a difficult task for any teacher. This task is compounded when students are learning English as a second language. These students often experience problems when attempting to respond in English to teacher questions and requests, even though they may know the necessary information.

Integrating Responsiveness to Cultural and Personal Diversity into Literacy Instruction

Listening to students was a distinguishing feature of a different classroom observed in the study. It was a fourth grade "transition room," that is, a class of students in their first year of virtually all-English language instruction. The teacher, Truman Collier, is monolingual with no formal background in second language acquisition, but with a real commitment to teaching minority students. Truman utilizes a relatively pure process approach involving writers' workshop, students' selections of books that they will read (in English), and a heavy emphasis on projects and journal writing.

He had just finished a conference with Ruben. Ruben was a quiet, bookworm type of student. Ruben wanted to next read a book about Michael Jordan. A boy in the room said, "Ruben has no business doing that – he doesn't know anything about sports." Mr. Collier overheard this remark and intervened. He said, "That's not true. Ruben and his brother watch soccer and basketball games all the time. He knows a lot about basketball." This is an illustration of Construct 6, Respect for and Understanding of Personal Diversity.

A minute later, Cynthia asked if it was all right to read a book about the Monitor and Merrimack again. She had read it in the fall, but felt her English was much better at the time of our observation and she knew a lot more about history. Mr. Collier said "sure" and then described to the class what Cynthia was doing and told them that it was okay to do this and it may make sense for a lot of the rest of them, because they've become much better readers to go back and reread something they had previously read.

These types of authentic (Goodman, 1988) interactions are interesting in that the students are treated like real people – with likes, dislikes, idiosyncrasies. The teacher actually remembered what they said, and usually he found it interesting. Note how in the second example, Truman also used this instance to directly draw students' attention to the benefits associated with rereading.

These techniques allow teachers to encourage and assist in oral English language development because:

- remarks and comments of students were taken seriously
- students were provided with opportunities to engage in extended discourse in English, using complex concepts and attempting to explain concepts in their own words (Construct 4 – Involvement).

Gersten & Woodward, 1993) consistently suggest that it is essential for the teacher to step in and provide a model.

We believe that the guidelines presented in this chapter for modulating instruction will allow for more sensitive, cognitively challenging, and ultimately, more effective teaching for language minority students.

References

Allen, V. G. (1989). Literature as a support to language acquisition. In P. Rigg & V.G. Allen (Eds.), When they don't all speak English (pp. 55-64). Urbana, IL: National Council of Teachers of English.

Anderson, V., & Roit, M. (1993). Reading as a gateway to language for primary students of limited English proficiency. Manuscript submitted to Educational Leadership for publication. Toronto, Ontario, Canada: Centre for Applied Cognitive Science, Ontario Institute for Studies in Education.

Au, K. (1992, April). Student purposes in peer- and teacher- guided literature discussions. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco.

Baker, K. A., & de Kanter, A. A. (1983). Bilingual education: A reappraisal of federal policy. Lexington, Massachusetts: Lexington Books.

Barrera, R. (1984). Bilingual reading in the primary grades: Some questions about questionable views and practices. In T.H. Escobar (Ed.), Early childhood bilingual education (pp. 164-183). New York: Teachers College Press.

Barringer, F. (April 28, 1993). When English is foreign tongue: Census finds a sharp rise in 80's. New York Times, 1,902(49, 315), pp. 1, 10.

Berman, P., Chambers, J., Gandara, P., McLaughlin, B., Minicucci, C., Nelson, B., Olson, L., & Parrish, T. (1992). Meeting the challenge of language diversity: Volume I, Executive summary. Berkeley, CA: BW Associates.

Carter, T.P., & Chatfield, M.L. (1986). Effective bilingual schools: Implications for policy and practice. American Journal of Education, 200-232.

Cazden, C.B. (1992). Whole language plus: Essays on literacy in the United States & New Zealand. New York: Teachers College Press.

Chamot, A.U. (1992, August). Changing instruction for language minority students to achieve national goals. Paper presented at Third National Research Symposium on Limited English Proficient Students, Office of Bilingual Education and Minority Languages Affairs, Arlington, VA.

Chamot, A. U., & O'Malley, J. M. (1989). The cognitive academic language learning approach. In P. Rigg & V. Allen (Eds.), When they don't all speak English (pp. 108-125). Urbana, IL: National Council of Teachers of English.

Gersten, R., & Woodward, J (1992). The quest to translate research into classroom practice: Strategies for assisting classroom teachers' work with "at risk" students and students with disabilities. In D. Carnine and E. Kameenui (Eds.). Higher cognitive functioning for all students (pp. 201-218). Austin, TX: Pro-Ed.

Gersten, R., & Woodward, J. (1985). A case for structured immersion. Educational Leadership, 43(1), 75-78.

Gersten, R., Woodward, J., & Darch, C. (1986). Direct instruction: A research-based approach for curriculum design and teaching. Exceptional Children, 53(1), 17-36.

Goldenberg, C. (1992/1993). Instructional conversations: Promoting comprehension through discussion. The Reading Teacher, 46(4), 316-326.

Goodman, K. (1988). The reading process. In P. L. Carrell, J. Devine, & D. E. Eskey (Ed.), Interactive approaches to second language reading (pp. 11-21). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Hakuta, K. (1986). Mirror of language. New York: Basic Books.

Hakuta, K., & Snow, C. (1986). The role of research in policy decisions about bilingual education . NABE News, 9(3), 1, 18-21.

Jiménez, R.T., & Gersten, R. (1993). Culture, community, and classroom: Chicano teachers' knowledge of and instructional strategies for teaching language minority students. Technical Report 93-1. Eugene, OR: Eugene Research Institute.

Krashen, S. (1982). Principles and practice in second language acquisition. New York: Pergamon.

Lambert, W.E., & Tucker, G.R. (1972). Bilingual education of children: The St. Lambert experiment. Rowley, MA: Newbury House.

Leinhardt, G. (1988). Expertise in instructional lessons: An example from fractions. In D.A. Grouws & T.J. Cooney (Eds.) Prospectives on research on effective mathematics teaching (pp. 48-64). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Long, M.H. (1983). Native speaker/non-native speaker conversation in the second language classroom. In M.A. Clarke & J. Handscombe (Eds.), On TESOL '82: Pacific perspectives on language learning and teaching (pp. 207-225). Washington, DC: TESOL.

Mercer, J.R., & Rueda, R. (1991, November). The impact of changing paradigms of disabilities on assessment for special education. Paper

Williams, J. D., & Snipper, G. C. (1990). Literacy and bilingualism. New York: Longman.

Willig, A. C. (1985). A meta-analysis of selected studies on the effectiveness of bilingual education. Review of Educational Research, 55(3), 269-317.

Wong-Fillmore, L., & Valadez, C. (1986). Teaching bilingual learners. In M.C. Wittrock (Ed.), Handbook of research on teaching (pp. 648-685). New York: MacMillan.

Yates, J.R., & Ortiz, A.A. (1991). Professional development needs of teachers who serve exceptional language minorities in today's schools. Teacher Education and Special Education, 14(1), 11-18.